**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY**
**CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

1. WRIT PETITION NO.3643 OF 1998,

Kailash Bhaguji Bhase, .. Petitioner
Vs
The State of Maharashtra & Ors. .. Respondents.
WITH

2. WRIT PETITION NO.3646 OF 1998,

Maruti Shripat Pawar .. Petitioner
Vs
The State of Maharashtra & Ors. .. Respondents.
WITH

3. WRIT PETITION NO.3647 OF 1998,

Navanath Eknath Pawar .. Petitioner
Vs
The State of Maharashtra & Ors. .. Respondents.
WITH

4. WRIT PETITION NO.3648 OF 1998,

Vithal Dhondiba Dhore .. Petitioner
Vs
The State of Maharashtra & Ors. .. Respondents.
WITH

5. WRIT PETITION NO.3649 OF 1998,

Samar Ravi Gupta .. Petitioner
Vs
The State of Maharashtra & Ors. .. Respondents.
WITH

6. WRIT PETITION NO.3650 OF 1998,

Bhaskar Sahadu Dhore .. Petitioner
Vs
The State of Maharashtra & Ors. .. Respondents.
WITH

7. WRIT PETITION NO.3651 OF 1998,

Dinkar Baburao Dhore, .. Petitioner
Vs
The State of Maharashtra & Ors. .. Respondents.

WITH

8. WRIT PETITION NO.3653 OF 1998,

Balaso Sadashiv Shinde .. Petitioner
Vs
The State of Maharashtra & Ors. .. Respondents.

WITH

9. WRIT PETITION NO.3654 OF 1998,

Kashiram Ganpat Chavan .. Petitioner
Vs
The State of Maharashtra & Ors. .. Respondents.

WITH

10. WRIT PETITION NO.3655 OF 1998,

Haribhau Tukaram Bhapkar .. Petitioner
Vs
The State of Maharashtra & Ors. .. Respondents.

WITH

11. WRIT PETITION NO.3642 OF 1998,

Hanumant Ranu Pansare, .. Petitioner.
Vs
The State of Maharashtra & ors. .. Respondents.

WITH

12. WRIT PETITION NO.3652 OF 1998

Bhau Khandu Bhagwat .. Petitioner
Vs
The State of Maharashtra & Ors. .. Respondents.

Mr V.P.Sawant, for the petitioner.
AGP for respondent nos 1 to 4.

**CORAM : V.G.PALSHIKAR, Ag.C.J., &**
**D.B.BHOSALE,J.**
**DATE : 06.12.2005.**

**PC:**

1. Heard the learned counsel for the parties.

2. All these petitions can be disposed of by one order.

3. Several petitions were filed challenging the notification dated 26.12.1997 issued under section 6 of the Land Acquisition Act. Some of the petitions came up before this Court for hearing. In Writ Petition No.3644 of 1998, this Court has observed as under:-

> ". For the view to be taken it is not necessary to set out the facts in detail. It is the case of the petitioner that his land could not have been acquired. Apart from that it is pointed out that there was no urgency and as such Section 5A ought not to have been executed.
> . When the matter came up for admission, interim relief was granted in terms of prayer clause (h) which in fact had the effect of restraining respondents from taking possession of the petitioner's land which was the subject matter of notification dated 26.12.1997.
> . Considering that long time has elapsed and the contentions advanced by the petitioner, ends of justice will be met if the declaration in so far as petitioner's land is concerned is quashed and set aside and the matter is remanded back to the concerned Special Land Acquisition Officer, Jadhavwadi Project to hear the objections filed by the petitioner as to why his land should not be acquired and thereafter to pass appropriate orders. On behalf of the petitioner, learned counsel makes a statement that they will not raise the objection that the declaration under Section 6 was not made within time or for that matter the award was not passed within the time as set out under Section 11A of the Land Acquisition Act. Statement accepted. Petition disposed of in terms aforestated."

4. These writ petitions, being identical to Writ Petition No.3644 of 1998, decided on 23.2.2005, are disposed of in terms of the above order.